

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Claims 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 18 and 19 are currently pending.

In the Office Action, Claims 7-8, 10-12, 14, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,751,667 to Ilnicki (“Ilnicki”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,981,265 to Rees (“Rees”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, deleting any message sent from the client network to a third port located in the server machine regardless of a security level of said message, and generating, in the gateway machine, a thread which establishes a second connection at a second security level between the gateway machine and the third port, wherein said third port is configured to receive at least a message at a second security level from the gateway machine via said second connection.

It is apparent that the applied reference, Ilnicki, fails to teach or suggest at least these features. In particular, Ilnicki fails to teach or suggest deleting any message sent from the client network to a third port located on the server machine regardless of a security level of said message. See, for example, Ilnicki, col. 5, lines 60-65, as cited by the Office. For example, Ilnicki discloses that only traffic for authorized ports are passed through the gateway (see Ilnicki, col. 5, lines 60-65). Thus, Ilnicki is not understood as teaching or suggesting deleting any message sent from the client network to a third port on a server machine, as recited in Claim 7. Furthermore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Ilnicki could be seen as teaching sending messages to a third port located on the server, because some of these messages are authorized, they will be let through, not deleted, as required by the claim. Therefore, Ilnicki does not teach or suggest that any message sent

from the client network to a third port located in the server machine regardless of a security level of the message will be deleted, as recited in Claim 7.

Further, as acknowledged in the Office Action, at page 4, Ilnicki fails to teach or suggest that the gateway machine establishes a second connection with a third port of the server machine. However, the Office Action alleges that Ilnicki's failure in this regard is cured by the teachings found in secondary reference Rees. In particular, it is alleged that Rees teaches that messages forwarded to port 1 inside the network can be forwarded to a different port inside the network by the gateway. However, it is apparent that Rees fails to teach that the second connection is at a second security level and that the third port is configured to receive at least a message at a second security level from the gateway machine via said second connection, as recited in Claim 7.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 7 distinguishes patentably from the applied references.

Claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, activating a secure application proxy that reroutes messages addressed to the first port of the server application so as to establish a second connection at a second security level between a second port of the server application and the gateway machine, and that deletes, any message sent from the client network to the second port of the server application regardless of the security level of said message, and that the second port is configured to receive at least one message at a second security level from the gateway via the second connection.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 14 distinguishes patentably from the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 7.

The remaining claims are also believed to be patentable due to their respective dependence from independent Claims 7 and 14, as well as for the additional features recited in the remaining claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T2147-907461) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 3, 2008

By: /Eric G. King/
Eric G. King
Reg. No. 42,736

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
Telephone: (703) 610-8647
4851-1875-4050

Otilia Gabor
Reg. No. 60,217